

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the final Office Action dated September 7, 2006, and the Advisory Action dated December 18, 2006. A requested for continued examination (RCE) and a petition for a two-month extension of time accompany this Response. Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. With this Response, independent claims 1, 8-10 and 19-20 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Applicants thank Examiner Manning for the telephone interview conducted on January 11, 2007. During the Interview, proposed amendments to independent claims 1, 8-10 and 19-20 were discussed. In particular, it was noted that the cited references fail to disclose that the subscription fee or cost associated with a CS digital broadcast is reduced in response to a viewer's selection of a symbolic label.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-15, 17 and 19-26 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Alexander et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931, hereafter "Alexander") in view of Blahut et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,532,735, "Blahut"). Additionally, claims 5, 16 and 18 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Alexander, Blahut and Remillard (U.S. Patent No. 5,561,708, hereafter "Remillard"). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claims 1, 8-10 and 19-20 have been amended to point out that the subscription fee or cost associated with a CS digital broadcast is reduced in response to a viewer's selection of a symbolic label (see, Applicants' Application, page 17, lines 11-14).

Conversely, Alexander makes no mention of video on demand (VOD) services or costs associated with the viewing of programs. Additionally, Blahut is merely directed towards controlling the display of advertisements and reducing the costs associated with viewing certain programs. Neither Alexander nor Blahut disclose the use of symbolic labels indicative of a given advertisement, let alone reducing a cost or fee associated with a digital broadcast in response to the selection of symbolic labels.

Moreover, Remillard fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Alexander and Blahut. Thus, even if it were appropriate to combine the teachings of Alexander, Blahut and Remillard, the combination still would not teach or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 1, 8-10 and 19-20 (as amended). Independent claims 1, 8-10 and 19-20 are patentably

distinguished over the cited references. Likewise, dependent claims 2-3, 4-7, 11-18, and 21-22-26 are patentably distinguished over the cited references based at least on their dependency from independent claims 1, 8-10 and 19-20.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any additional fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Director is authorized to deduct such fees from deposit account no. 02-1818.

Respectfully submitted,

BY 

Thomas C. Basso
Registration No. 46,541
Cust. No. 29175

Dated: February 7, 2007